

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed April 19, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-37 are pending.

In paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagrees with the characterization of the teachings of Brown cited by the Office Action.

Brown discloses a method for dynamically allocates the size and number of buffers to optimally receive and transmit packets of communications data over a communications link. Channels are not assigned priority, but rather it appears that print jobs are assigned a priority level. Referring to column 6, lines 40-43, Brown discloses that "an active port may attempt to "steal" RAM that has been previously allocated to another active port by comparing the priority level of their respective print jobs. In addition, Brown discloses, with reference to Fig. 12 for example, that memory (i.e., buffer space) may be taken from memory assigned to another port by determining "whether or not any other active port has a print job of a lower priority than the print job of the current active port." (See, column 21, lines 21-23.

Furthermore, Brown does not assign priorities to channels as alleged by the Office Action at column 20, lines 24-30 of Brown, but rather Brown assigns maximum allocations of buffer memory according to the type of port. Brown then only changes allocations of memory by determining that a first data message at a first port has a higher priority level than a second data message at a second port and re-allocating at least a portion of memory to the second port from said first port.

Nevertheless, Brown clear fails to suggest assigning priority values to data channels of a printer that receive print jobs, associating the priority value assigned to the data channel of the printer with the print jobs received by the printer at its respective data channel and printing the print jobs by the printer in an order corresponding to their associated priority values.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Brown fails to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations recited in the claims.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 09/550,420
BLD920000004US1(IBMN.008US01-0503)
Amdt. Dated June 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicants, David W. Lynch, at 651-686-6633 Ext. 116.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By:



David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204

BEST AVAILABLE COPY